

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS**

**Eighty-First Session
April 5, 2021**

The Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair Edgar Flores at 9:01 a.m. on Monday, April 5, 2021, Online. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/81st2021.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Edgar Flores, Chair
Assemblywoman Selena Torres, Vice Chair
Assemblywoman Natha C. Anderson
Assemblywoman Annie Black
Assemblywoman Tracy Brown-May
Assemblywoman Venicia Considine
Assemblywoman Jill Dickman
Assemblywoman Bea Duran
Assemblyman John Ellison
Assemblywoman Susie Martinez
Assemblyman Andy Matthews
Assemblyman Richard McArthur
Assemblywoman Clara Thomas

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst
Erin Sturdivant, Committee Counsel
Judith Bishop, Committee Manager
Lindsey Howell, Committee Secretary
Cheryl Williams, Committee Assistant



OTHERS PRESENT:

Troyce Krumme, Vice Chair, Las Vegas Police Managers and Supervisors Association
William Huddler, Chair, Las Vegas Police Managers and Supervisors Association
Chuck Callaway, Police Director, Office of Intergovernmental Services, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department
Michael Cathcart, Business Operations Manager, City of Henderson
Eric Spratley, Executive Director, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association
Joanna Jacob, Government Affairs Manager, Clark County
Mary-Sarah Kinner, Government Affairs Liaison, Washoe County Sheriff's Office
Steven Cohen, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Calli Wilsey, Senior Management Analyst-Intergovernmental Relations, City of Reno
Jim Hoffman, Member, Legislative Committee, Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice
Jennifer Kandt, Executive Director, Funeral and Cemetery Services Board
Rebecca Gipson, Chief of Staff, City of North Las Vegas
Ryann Juden, City Manager, City of North Las Vegas
Pamela Goynes-Brown, Councilwoman, Ward 2, City of North Las Vegas
Alfredo Melesio Jr., Assistant City Manager, City of North Las Vegas
Rhiann Jarvis Denman, Deputy City Attorney, City of North Las Vegas
Darlene Anderson, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada
Annemarie Grant, Private Citizen, Quincy, Massachusetts
John Carlo, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada

Chair Flores:

[The meeting was called to order. Assembly rules and protocol were explained.] We are going to take the agenda slightly out of order. We will be hearing Assembly Bill 271 first, followed by Assembly Bill 437. We will then enter the presentation by the City of North Las Vegas. I know it will not be that long, so we can focus our energy on Assembly Bill 55. With that, we will go ahead and open up the hearing on Assembly Bill 271.

Assembly Bill 271: Establishes certain requirements for law enforcement agencies. (BDR 23-923)

Troyce Krumme, Vice Chair, Las Vegas Police Managers and Supervisors Association: Joining me this morning is William Huddler, our association chair. Our association represents the captains, lieutenants, and sergeants of the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (LVMPD). Assembly Bill 271 is a bill designed to require primary law enforcement agencies in certain Nevada counties to provide an adequate number of uniformed first-line supervisors to oversee the work that police officers do in the patrol environment.

As policing has seen an increased call for enhanced accountability, and rightfully so, we must remain vigilant in this effort. Based on a pattern of action by the United States Department of Justice, we can be confident that span of control is an integral component of meaningful police reform, as is evidenced in the several consent decrees in various police agencies around the country. Patrol officers are typically the first responders on calls that can turn into a critical incident at a moment's notice. Studies have shown that the mere presence of a first-line supervisor on calls such as these can greatly reduce the frequency of the use of force from occurring. Understanding this, police agencies in Nevada, such as LVMPD, have adopted policies that require first-line supervisors to acknowledge and respond to calls where certain details are provided, such as when a subject is armed.

Police departments also need to do all they can to prevent instances of police misconduct. The first line of defense in this effort is an available and observant first-line supervisor. Ensuring that agencies have the appropriate ratio of uniformed first-line supervisors to uniformed peace officers is a step this body can take to achieve these efforts.

Now I am going to go over the bill and then open it up for questions from the Committee.

This bill will add to *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 289. It is going to read as follows [Troyce Krumme read from the proposed amendment to [Assembly Bill 271, Exhibit C](#)]:

1. In a county whose population is 100,000 or more: (a) Each primary law enforcement agency shall: (1) Maintain a supervisor ratio of at least 1 first-line supervisor per 12 nonsupervisory peace officers; (2) Ensure consistency in the supervision of nonsupervisory peace officers by assigning each nonsupervisory peace officer to a single first-line supervisor; and (3) Schedule the operational period of a first-line supervisor in a manner that ensures that the first-line supervisor is physically available to supervise the number of nonsupervisory peace officers required to conform with the supervisor ratio described in subparagraph (1); and (b) A first-line supervisor shall: (1) Assist in the de-escalation of any volatile situation; (2) Provide supervision and direction as necessary in circumstances in which nonsupervisory peace officer employs the use of force; (3) Respond as necessary to circumstances in which a nonsupervisory peace officer employed the use of force; and (4) If required by law or the policies of the law enforcement agency, investigate each circumstance in which a nonsupervisory peace officer employed the use of force and ensure that there is documentation of each such circumstance.
2. The requirements described in paragraph (a) of subsection 1: (a) Apply to first-line supervisors and nonsupervisory peace officers whose primary duties include routine patrol. (b) Consider a field training peace officer and the assigned trainee of the peace officer to be

one peace officer for the purpose of any such requirement. 3. As used in this section: (a) "First-line supervisor" means a peace officer who supervises other persons and who is on an organizational level immediately above nonsupervisory peace officers.

At the bottom, it gives an explanation of what a "primary law enforcement agency" means:

(b) "Primary law enforcement agency" means: (1) A police department of an incorporated city; (2) The sheriff's office of a county; or (3) If the county is within the jurisdiction of a metropolitan police department, the metropolitan police department.

Section 2 provides that NRS 354.599 does "not apply to any additional expenses of a local government that are related to the provisions of this act." Finally, we did remove the effective date of July 1, meaning that the intent of this bill is to become effective on October 1, 2021. The purpose behind that was, should this bill become law, it would give police agencies enough time, should they see the need to promote additional supervisors, to get them trained properly prior to going in the streets.

That is the completion of the amended bill language. Chairman Huddler and I are open to any questions.

Chair Flores:

Members, I want to make it clear that we are going off the mock-up [[Exhibit C](#)], which is under our exhibit list, not the original language. With that, we will open it up for questions, starting with Assemblywoman Thomas.

Assemblywoman Thomas:

With the conceptual amendment that you submitted, I was just wondering why you made this change. Originally, you had a ratio of 1 to 10. Why is it 1 to 12 now?

Troyce Krumme:

We had some meetings last week with some stakeholders. The original intent of the 1 to 10 ratio was to be in a restrictive manner. However, this is going to be the first time something like this will appear in law. One of the stakeholders suggested that the original ratio might be a little bit too restrictive and asked if they could allow a little room. Since the Legislature only meets every two years, if they identified some potential issues, they would have to wait two years to address them. Based on that, on top of reading some of the fiscal impacts, it looked like if we went to 1 to 12—which currently matches the LVMPD policy—it would provide some fiscal relief to those agencies providing the fiscal note, and then allow a bit of leeway as we work into this mission.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

When it comes to the amended section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (a), subparagraph (3), could you expand a little more on what you mean by "in a manner that ensures that the first-line supervisor is physically available"? Does that mean that they do not need to be there, but can get there quickly? I am confused by the language and what exactly that would mean in reality versus policy language.

Troyce Krumme:

That is a great question. That was actually one of the changes that came up through our stakeholder meeting. In the original language, it appeared as if the supervisor assigned to the officer would have to always be at work. Obviously, that is just not the case; supervisors are allowed to take vacations and sick leave sometimes. We wanted to craft this language so that if agencies wanted to use overtime supervisors to call in and cover those shifts where a sergeant is not available—or for some of the larger agencies, if they opted to promote a cadre of centralized assigned sergeants that are not necessarily assigned to squads—then that cadre of supervisors could be used to backfill any supervisors in the field that are off. That language was changed to pick some of that up.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

Is that also where section 1, subsection 2, paragraph (a) comes from, where it only applies to the first-line supervisors? Was that language added for the same reason, or was there another line of reasoning for that?

Troyce Krumme:

That is correct. Our intent with this bill is to address the patrol environment. Some of the larger agencies have detective bureaus, which do a lot of their work out of the office. We wanted to ensure that the language in the bill addressed what the intent was, which was for the patrol environment. Additionally, there were some concerns that the stakeholders of the original language of the bill picked up—corrections environment—and that is not our intent. Corrections already has some oversight that provides minimum staffing levels, so we did not need to pick that up in this bill.

Assemblyman Ellison:

I do not know how many Washoe has on the force—how many police, deputies, and everything. What about Las Vegas? What I am trying to figure out is this is going to have a large impact back on your budgets, is it not?

Troyce Krumme:

That was part of the stakeholder meetings that we did have. There is little doubt that there is going to be some fiscal impact. I believe the fiscal impact lessens on some of the smaller agencies, such as Henderson, North Las Vegas, and Mesquite, from the change of 1 to 10 to 1 to 12. But for some of the larger agencies, it will have an impact. If I remember reading Washoe County's fiscal impact correctly, it sounds like they might already be meeting the mark. I do not remember exactly how they worded their concerns, but I believe that with

Washoe County already meeting the mark, there were some questions about what it would take for Reno to get there. Again, that is one of the reasons why we massaged from 10 nonsupervisory police officers to 12.

Assemblyman Ellison:

Can you give me an idea of how many police officers are in Las Vegas?

Troyce Krumme:

Commissioned peace officers?

Assemblyman Ellison:

Yes.

Troyce Krumme:

I believe it is between 3,000 and 3,500.

Assemblyman Ellison:

If you figure that you are going to be dividing them into 12—not counting administration and those sorts of positions—that has to have a large impact. I do not know if they will do this by shifts or how they will do that in order to supervise something like this. It seems to be awfully hard and expensive. Are they not doing their duties now?

Troyce Krumme:

I am going to bring in Chairman Huddler to assist on this point.

William Huddler, Chair, Las Vegas Police Managers and Supervisors Association:

I think a couple of assumptions lie in there—for example, that all of those police officers work uniformed patrol. If you guys can recall some of the incidents that have been centralized in our media lately associated with civil rights violations: those usually have to do with officers who are first responders on patrol, or even a special weapons and tactics environment. Of the 3,000-plus police officers that are in a large agency like the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police, you consider that there are ten area commands. Within Las Vegas, within each area command, you have around 150 police officers, so you are looking at 1,500 patrol personnel. The assumption is, okay, take those 1,500 patrol personnel—or right about there—and divide that by 12. That is how many patrol sergeants. The numbers can be inflated, and we could use that algorithm to try to fill this gap, which is a crucial gap, but quite frankly, that is not the solution that is required. Let me give you an example: We made the amendment to move away from the traditional model of a sergeant leading a group of officers—team policing is what we usually do on the West Coast—working that same shift and that same hour. Essentially, you could say, you would have to double the number of sergeants or first-line supervisors in patrol. You do not need to do that. What my colleague mentioned earlier is a feasible solution. It has been employed in other agencies around the country.

If I can paint the picture for you—and I will be as brief as possible—currently, large agencies, not unlike Las Vegas Metropolitan Police, have a watch commander program where there are lieutenants who cover the valley 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. There are five full-time watch commanders, and they work 12-hour shifts. Well, instead of doubling the number of sergeants and patrol, which could be in excess of well over 100 sergeants, you could promote a small group of sergeants and assign them to watch commanders. Those sergeants could float throughout the east and west sides of the valley. They can be assigned at the beginning of their shift as necessary; for example, if a sergeant is quarantined, he or she is now down for several days. One of these watch commanders, sergeants, or whatever the agency decides to designate them, can be assigned to supervise those officers for that operational period.

It is not just use of force that we are talking about here. The cost is what I am going to try to address here. What was the cost this summer when we were having our protests? What was the cost, the fiscal impact? What was the impact on public trust? The true measure of police efficacy is public trust. We should not be looking at tickets and arrest numbers. We should be looking at whether or not people feel good about dealing with their police agency. Just like this Committee runs more smoothly with a chair and a vice chair, a team of police officers runs more smoothly with an available first-line supervisor. I hope that addresses your question.

Chair Flores:

Members, do we have any additional questions? [There were none.] At this time, I would like to invite those wishing to testify in support of Assembly Bill 271 to call in. [There was no one.] At this time, I would like to invite those wishing to testify in opposition to Assembly Bill 271 to call in.

Chuck Callaway, Police Director, Office of Intergovernmental Services, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department:

We are here in strong opposition to A.B. 271. We believe that this is a bill seeking to fix a problem that does not exist. Under our current department policy, we have the capability for a supervisor to call in other supervisors on overtime if the span of control goes beyond 12. This was an issue that was negotiated in collective bargaining, and it should remain a collective bargaining issue. I am not aware of any public body or government agency that has a state statute that requires a certain number of supervisors per their personnel. It is clearly a management right to allocate our resources. Every shift is different and may require different resources based on the job that shift must perform.

This bill would result in adding a lot of additional supervisors, which, due to financial concerns, we would probably have to pull from our workforce to fill those positions. It would result in a decrease in actual officers working the street and handling calls because we would have to shift some of those officers to supervisory positions. And we have a testing process in place for supervisors, so there would be a concern about getting supervisors tested and meeting the criteria to become a supervisor.

I have heard comments that this is a reform issue. If it is a reform issue, why is there a population cap on it? Certainly, if the unions are trying to claim that this is a reform issue, it should apply equally to all agencies across the state. I also have concerns with section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (b), which says that a supervisor "shall" assist in de-escalation. Sometimes this is impossible—a supervisor may be on another priority call. Officers are trained in de-escalation and saying that a supervisor shall assist in any case of de-escalation is literally impossible and could result in liability against the agency. In fact, all of section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (b) is currently covered in our department policy.

Again, this strips the department of its ability to manage our resources. We currently have 3,301 police officers on the agency. Some of the testimony in support of the bill said you could do this, you could float officers here, or you could create a roving sergeant patrol—again, that is management's authority to allocate our resources. This was an issue of collective bargaining. In other issues where we, for example, wanted officers to carry the substance for opioid overdose, they said, well, that is a matter of collective bargaining. If we want officers to wear bulletproof vests, that is a matter of collective bargaining. If we want officers to wear body cameras, that is a matter of collective bargaining. But in this case, the union wants to put something that has been collectively bargained into statute, so we are clearly opposed.

Assemblywoman Anderson:
May I ask a question?

Chair Flores:

I think we are going to wait for now. We have a lot on the agenda. Could we continue with the next caller in opposition?

Michael Cathcart, Business Operations Manager, City of Henderson:

The City of Henderson is a full-service city, which means we provide all municipal services, including police, fire, parks and recreation, water, wastewater, and planning and zoning, among others. Each year, we are required by state law to submit a balanced budget through the Department of Taxation. On an annual basis, we have a robust discussion on staffing needs in all service areas and make determinations based on resources available. The city is opposed to A.B. 271 because of the mandated staffing ratio. It is our belief that these discussions should be at the local level. This bill would limit the city council's ability to determine the best use of city resources on an annual basis. But I also want to thank Mr. Krumme for spending time with us last week and listening to our concerns.

Eric Spratley, Executive Director, Nevada Sheriffs' and Chiefs' Association:

We oppose A.B. 271 outright, as the staffing ratios for public agencies need to rest with the elected or appointed administrator for the agency. They were elected by the people or appointed by the government or body to run. Legislating a hard number in statute negatively affects leadership's ability to manage their agency. The agency head should be the one determining the proper span of control and scheduling within the agency based on staffing, assignments, emergency operations, and utilization of resources. You have heard testimony

that agencies are already doing this, so this is a solution in search of a problem. We submit to you that there is not a problem, so we ask you to not consider this bill. Ditto to what Chuck Callaway testified to, and ditto to what Mike Cathcart testified to.

Joanna Jacob, Government Affairs Manager, Clark County:

We filed a fiscal note on this bill that was on the original language, which would have been a cost of over \$69 million to Clark County each year of the biennium. With the amendment, we believe that we could revise that fiscal note because the original language would have required us to have this staffing ratio with our Juvenile Justice Division. Clark County also funds 100 percent of the cost of the Clark County Detention Center. We believe that the amendment does narrow down the scope of this bill, but there are some things that were discussed during the hearing today that were identified by Mr. Callaway about floating and things such as this that are not specifically stated in the amendment. We are still trying to work out the fiscal impact to Clark County, but I will note that we are responsible for 63 percent of the cost for the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department and so there will still be an impact to Clark County regardless of how the bill is amended. I echo the concerns of Mr. Cathcart about the balanced budget that must be submitted. We will continue to work with the proponents; we did speak with Sergeant Krumme about the amendment and the intent, but at this time, we are opposed based on fiscal impact to the county.

Mary-Sarah Kinner, Government Affairs Liaison, Washoe County Sheriff's Office:

As was brought up during testimony, the Washoe County Sheriff's Office's current supervisor-to-deputy ratio is 1 to 8.5. We meet the staffing ratio, but do not have supervisors supervising deputies on the same shift, at the same location, 100 percent of the time. As a result of our 8-, 10-, and 12-hour shifts, our supervisors share in the job of supervising deputies. We have submitted a fiscal note on this and remain opposed to A.B. 271.

Steven Cohen, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

The nature of my opposition is the section involving volatile situations. I do not think that it goes far enough to address interactions between law enforcement and people with disabilities, but I am more than happy to work with the sponsor, as well as the Committee, on potential language to accomplish that.

Calli Wilsey, Senior Management Analyst–Intergovernmental Relations, City of Reno:

We thank Mr. Krumme for meeting with us last week to discuss the intent of this bill and listen to our concerns. The City of Reno is still opposed to this bill even with the amendment because we expect to continue to see a significant fiscal impact. Additionally, it is critically important that a local government maintain its ability to manage its budget in the best way to address the needs of each local community. I echo the comments made by my fellow colleagues who have already spoken in opposition today.

Chair Flores:

We will go to the next caller in opposition to A.B. 271. [There was no one.] We will go to those wishing to testify in the neutral position on A.B. 271.

Jim Hoffman, Member, Legislative Committee, Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice:

I am representing Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice. I apologize, but I was not able to get on during the support portion. This is testimony in support. With the Chair's permission, I would like to testify in support at this time.

Chair Flores:

We will switch it over to support.

Jim Hoffman:

Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice supports A.B. 271. Police violence and other misconduct are persistent, ongoing problems in Nevada. A lot of this misconduct is talked about in terms of isolated bad apples who do not represent police as a profession or their departments as a whole. To the extent that this argument is accurate, stronger requirements for supervisor staffing will help address the problem and ensure more effective oversight. We do not want these bad apples to spoil the bunch, and this bill would take a step toward preventing that. Nevada Attorneys for Criminal Justice therefore supports A.B. 271.

Chair Flores:

Now we will go to those wishing to testify in the neutral position on Assembly Bill 271. [There was no one.] At this time, we will come back to our presenters for closing remarks.

Troyce Krumme:

First, we would like to thank Speaker Frierson for sponsoring this bill. In closing, we need to acknowledge that we are currently living in the age of police reform. Police agencies, police leaders, police officers, and police associations in Nevada are not against reform. In fact, we in police departments reform all the time—we just refer to it as change. From evolving use-of-force policies to critical incident review processes, police agencies in Nevada work hard to get these things right and protect the communities we serve. Police associations support those efforts. Effective reform must be evidence-based, designed from best practices, and have the intent of building public trust. The evidence shows that an appropriate number of uniformed first-line supervisors to lead uniformed patrol officers decreases the use of force, lessens the possibility of misconduct, and by doing so, will increase public trust. This is why this issue is a reform idea. We would like to encourage the Committee to approve this bill and encourage the necessary funding to the police agencies to accomplish this mission.

Chair Flores:

I appreciate the presentation, and hopefully, we can get some dialogue to continue throughout the week. Maybe we can get somewhere where a few folk can jump onto the neutral or support side. With that, we will go ahead and close out the hearing on Assembly Bill 271. Next, we will open up the hearing on Assembly Bill 437.

Assembly Bill 437: Revises provisions relating to dead bodies. (BDR 40-513)

Jennifer Kandt, Executive Director, Funeral and Cemetery Services Board:

I am here to present Assembly Bill 437. We actually sat before the Sunset Subcommittee recently, and they were generous enough to entertain a few changes that had come to our attention and needed to occur. I did include some very basic information on the transportation across state lines that came to us through an email [[Exhibit D](#)]. Basically, it has to do with transporting bodies across state lines when the nearest funeral home resides across that state line. As you can see from that email I included, specifically referencing Laughlin, Nevada, and Bullhead City, Arizona, a body would typically travel all the way to Boulder City. The family then has to pay two different funeral homes, and the body is travelling great distances simply because the nearest funeral home resides over state lines. The language that came about in the bill references the coroner approving that transfer. We certainly do not have any issues with that. I assume that maybe they were contacted because there is a significant amount of language in there.

The second part of what we had originally asked for has to do with our embalmers. With embalmers, because we have a requirement for the apprenticeship that they have 60 semester or 90 quarter hours of non-mortuary science coursework before they can begin the internship, we have actually had instances where someone has graduated from mortuary school and then we have to require them to take a few more credits because they did not quite meet that credit requirement. I did submit an amendment [[Exhibit E](#)] that still has to do with our original request, which was that 60-semester, 90-quarter hours. It is just that I had not seen any draft language before the bill dropped.

If the Committee will entertain a couple more changes that have come to our attention, we would certainly appreciate that. One has been that because of the pandemic, we have had several embalmers who are residing in Las Vegas who want to come out of retirement, but because they have not been working as an embalmer in the past two years, we would have to have them do an apprenticeship again. That is doable; they are basically working under someone, but it would certainly be friendlier to not have to require that. You can see the section in the amendment under *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 642.100—if the Committee would allow us to simply say that they have "practiced actively for two of the last five years" instead of the two years immediately preceding, I think that would be beneficial to some of those people who have wanted to come out of retirement to assist in the pandemic.

Lastly, it is our understanding that the College of Southern Nevada had been working on a mortuary science program. It came to my attention that we may need to allow them to be in the embalming room observing. They would have to get families to sign off on that, based on the current language. If we could just add that "students of an accredited mortuary science program" would be allowed into the prep room, that would be helpful as well.

With that, if there are any questions, I am happy to take those.

Chair Flores:

With that, we will open it up for questions, starting with Assemblyman Ellison.

Assemblyman Ellison:

On the highway last night, I spent some time on the phone with the coroner from Elko County on this bill. What he told me was that it would be only two areas in Elko; one would be up in Owyhee and the other would be Jackpot. Those would be the only things that this bill would pertain to. But he said that the way this bill is written right now—and I am hoping he is going to call in either under neutral or opposed—by the time there was a question of where they found a body, it would take up to two to three weeks sometimes to get the report back to go to the coroner. Here, it says that this does not always go to the coroner. Is that correct?

Jennifer Kandt:

In terms of the language that was drafted here for the transportation across the state line section, it references the coroner authorizing the transportation, but they would be doing that prior to a removal permit being issued, which is usually what would happen. Typically, a funeral home in Nevada would go into the electronic death registry system. They would basically submit information that goes to vital records to get a removal permit to take the body out of the state. This seems to suggest that the coroner in that county would authorize it, and I do not know how that authorization would occur. I assume it could be as simple as a phone call or an email saying, Can we take this body? We do not think that this is going to be a coroner case; then the coroner could allow them to take it across state lines. Then they could have the coroner issue the death certificate after that. Certainly, if there are concerns from the coroner's officer about how this part is written, I would defer to them because in terms of the funeral board really having a say in this, we do not; these involve vital records and the coroner. But it is an issue that we had brought to the Sunset Subcommittee's attention based on that email that I included as part of my exhibits.

Assemblyman Ellison:

If you have a body where it is not determined if the death was of natural causes or homicide, it would still go back to the State of Nevada crime lab, usually in Washoe County, from every place but Clark County. If that is the case, then the body would not be transferred to Idaho, or any place like that; it would have to be transferred back to Washoe to determine the cause of death. Is that not correct?

Jennifer Kandt:

It is my understanding based on reading this that this would only apply to cases that would not be coroner cases. If there was an understanding that this was a case that would have to go to the coroner's office for any type of autopsy, this would not apply. Initially, they typically get transported to a funeral home, especially in those rural counties. Then they go from the funeral home to Washoe County, usually, and the Clark County Office of the Coroner/Medical Examiner.

Assemblyman Ellison:

We did not know the bill was going to jump up that quickly. I apologize for that. I am hoping that he does call in, and he can give us his concerns.

Chair Flores:

Members, any additional questions? [There were none.] At this time, we will go to the phone lines and invite those wishing to testify in support of Assembly Bill 437 to call in. [There was no one.] At this time, we will go to those wishing to call in opposition to Assembly Bill 437. [There were none.] It is my understanding that a few folk are trying to call in. Should you be in opposition or support during the neutral testimony, please still call in. I want to make sure that we give you an opportunity to get on the record. For now, we will move to those wishing to call in the neutral position.

Joanna Jacob, Government Affairs Manager, Clark County:

I am calling in neutral based on the testimony. I was listening to this bill, and I would like to work with Ms. Kandt on this. This bill did drop very quickly, as Assemblyman Ellison noted. I apologize to Ms. Kandt because we actually have flagged this with our coroner's office as a potential fiscal impact to Clark County. I would like to work with her on the clarification, as she stated on the record. I am just testifying as neutral on this, with apologies to Ms. Kandt, to say that we would like to work with her on this.

I will clarify the fiscal impact: When we read this bill, we thought that it may impact the coroner's office. We have approximately 1,600 cases on average that this may impact. That was our fiscal concern. I almost neglected to put that on the record.

Chair Flores:

We will go to the next caller wishing to testify in the neutral position to A.B. 437. [There was no one.] I will put this out there one more time: If there is anybody wishing to testify in support, opposition, or neutral to A.B. 437, please call in at this time. I know that you are trying to get on the record, so I am trying to give you some time to call in. We have some folk from Elko calling in. [There was no one.]

Assemblyman Ellison, I know that you were trying to make a statement.

Assemblyman Ellison:

We had your office trying to get ahold of him because he called me last night. What I would like to do, if I could, is get a written statement from the coroner [[Exhibit F](#)], then maybe get it to you and get it in the record. One of the issues was also that one of the areas pertaining to Clark and Elko is Indian reservations and a sovereign nation issue and out-of-state issues. There were some concerns there also, so I am hoping that I can at least get it in writing and get it to you prior to the bill going to work session.

Chair Flores:

Please let the record reflect that we do know for a fact that the coroner from Elko was trying to call in. We will make sure that we get the written statement submitted on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System and that all members receive that in their inbox. Ms. Kandt, any closing remarks?

Jennifer Kandt:

I just want to state that we would defer to the coroner's office in all situations that are related to this bill. However they want to make changes they think are suitable, we would certainly think it is their right to do so. This was more an attempt to help families with crossing state lines and not having to pay two funeral homes in the process and having bodies transferring long distances. If the coroners have issues with how this is written, we are open to whatever language they would suggest.

Chair Flores:

I am confident that they have a week to work with a lot of different stakeholders, and that we will get to a place where everybody is comfortable. Thank you, Assemblyman Ellison, for getting Elko's concerns on the record. I am sure Ms. Kandt will reach out. With that, we will go ahead and close out the hearing on Assembly Bill 437.

Next, we will open it up for the presentation by the City of North Las Vegas. Members, I want to remind you to please refrain from asking any questions pertaining to the bill itself. We will do that during the bill hearing. This time, it is just for us to get our feet wet and get a general understanding of what the City of North Las Vegas is doing, plans on doing, and has been doing. Afterward, we will go into the hearing itself. We will go ahead and open up the presentation.

Rebecca Gipson, Chief of Staff, City of North Las Vegas:

Joining me today is Councilwoman Pamela Goynes-Brown, City Manager Ryann Juden, Assistant City Manager Alfredo Melesio, and Finance Director William Harty. We appreciate the opportunity to give this Committee a closer look at the City of North Las Vegas and brief you on our efforts to both mitigate the current health crisis presented by COVID-19 and combat the economic challenges presented as a result of the pandemic. With that, I will turn the presentation over to Councilwoman Goynes-Brown and City Manager Juden.

Ryann Juden, City Manager, City of North Las Vegas:

I did hear him when he said the presentation would not go all that long. I appreciate that guidance, and we will try to follow that. I also want to thank the Legislative Counsel Bureau for the very structured and seamless process for this hearing today. I do know that with all the changes that are happening during the pandemic, being able to communicate and having these kinds of public conversations is not an easy thing to accommodate. I do want to recognize them and let you know, Chair, that they have done a tremendous job in making sure this is very easy for us to do.

Going to our slide presentation [[Exhibit G](#)], especially following the chair's counsel to keep it short, you know a lot about the City of North Las Vegas. Our city council is made up of four wards. They are each elected individually in their ward. We also have a mayor that is elected at-large citywide. One of the things you will notice on the map on page 2 of the presentation [page 2, [Exhibit G](#)] is that there is a lot of space left for growth in North Las Vegas. That is really where you will see a lot of the growth in southern Nevada; it will be happening within the City of North Las Vegas if we continue to grow that city.

Similar to other incorporated cities in Nevada, we have a council/manager structure of government [page 3]. The city council provides direction for the city. The city manager hires all the staff, prepares a budget and staffing plan, and makes recommendations on policy decisions. We have a very good working relationship between management and our elected officials. In concert with the city attorney's office, that relationship was on display as we worked through the pandemic hand in hand with our elected officials. We were able to be very nimble in addressing the immediate concerns that our community was facing.

You will see some of the highlights from these past two years on this slide [page 4]. There is one very large one; the members that have been on the Committee for a while know that the City of North Las Vegas has worked very hard to get Apex Industrial Park open for business. With the approval of a \$250 million water line going out to Apex and a sewer line coming back to Apex, this really prepares a breadbasket for economic development for southern Nevada. Opening those 18,000 acres north of town is something that has been vital to our region, something our region has really lacked when we compare ourselves with other peer regions throughout the country, especially in the Southwest. You can see that we have led the home sales in Clark County with new home sales. We have also seen 18 million square feet of new construction that has happened this year. It is definitely a lot of growth that is happening in North Las Vegas. If you drive north on Interstate 15, from Craig Road going out toward Apex, you will see the growth on either side. This has been a priority of the mayor and council. We have implemented a policy called "grownomics," where we sought to address the fiscal challenges we inherited in the City of North Las Vegas in 2014 by growing a new tax base.

This slide [page 5] is our budget. It was not too long ago—in fact, five years ago—when the City of North Las Vegas had a \$156 million, long-term structural shortfall. Our credit rating was junk, junk, junk status. We came to the Legislature in 2017, passed Senate Bill 78 of the 79th Session by working with the Legislature. That was a critical bill. Chair Flores remembers well that that bill allowed us to start to change the credit of the City of North Las Vegas. We just saw an example of that this past week, where we were able to go to bond and refinance some bonds that saved the city, on that particular bond sale, about \$400,000 a year. In total, by refinancing bonds, we have been able to increase our credit rating, thanks to the Legislature working with us. We are saving ratepayers millions and millions of dollars a year that was just in interest payments going to banks. That has resulted in the increase in services, which allowed us to bring things back into the city, such as our community corrections facility.

You will notice that consolidated taxes are a large portion of our budget. When the pandemic hit, as well as with all local and state government, that was a big impact to us. At that time, we were looking at a three-year shortfall of \$107 million. Because projections have been a little better than what we initially projected, we have seen that cut in half. We are still looking at a structural deficit over three years, but we believe with the efforts we took, as well as with the federal relief dollars that are coming in, we are going to be able to continue doing all we can to make sure that our services to our residents are not impacted.

On this slide [page 6], you will see that public safety, like other local governments, is a very large portion of our budget. If you ask most of our residents when they look to our municipal government to provide services, the answer is police and fire services. That is one of the primary roles that we play as a local government directly with the people. Yes, we have libraries, parks, and all kinds of other wonderful services for our residents, but at the end of the day, public safety is something that they expect from local government.

The next slide [page 7] is about Coronavirus Aid, Relief and Economic Security (CARES) dollars. We took a much different approach than a lot of other jurisdictions that you have talked with when it comes to CARES dollars. Just a quick timeline: States began receiving these funds in mid-April. It was not until June 29 that the Governor announced the funding plan of how these dollars would be allocated to local governments. Many of the members of this Committee work with the City of North Las Vegas. When we learned that we were being excluded from direct allocation of dollars, thankfully, Clark County stepped up and provided a subgrant award of \$23.7 million.

Right away, the council prioritized getting these dollars into the community to shore up the tax base and to make sure that we could avoid the economic crisis that the city weathered during the Great Recession. They set a goal for 80 percent of these dollars to be put directly into the community. It is important to recognize that if you see the allocation, 83 percent of these dollars did go directly to the community. This was in concert with working with our employees, our unions, and our labor groups to make sure that we were able to facilitate this goal. The 17 percent that went to the city did so in the form of mitigating the direct effects of COVID-19, from personal protective equipment, to vaccination efforts, to changes we needed to make within the city hall in order to accommodate social distancing. Really, we used the CARES dollars we received as direct relief dollars.

I just want to highlight a couple of things about these CARES dollars [page 8]; then we will dive into COVID-19 testing quickly and the Southern Nevada Urban Micro Academy (SNUMA). If you all recall, it was March 13, Friday the 13th, that there was a statewide declaration of emergency. I have not been through a lot of statewide declarations of

emergency, but I think, generally speaking, when they happen on Friday the 13, they are not going to be good news. As we are still operating within a state of emergency in the state, we have seen that this has truly been the case.

One thing that I wanted to highlight is how our staff responded to COVID-19 directly. A great example of this is looking at our library staff. That declaration was on Friday. By Tuesday morning, our library staff was at Three Square, providing and packing lunches for students. On Sunday, schools were closed, and we were concerned about where many of our students would get their next meals. We had library staff, as well as parking enforcement and other staff who may not be essential in a time of pandemic; we transitioned them very quickly to providing essential services for our community. They were packing food at Three Square; later on, they were trained by Southern Nevada Health District in contact tracing. They were actively contacting and calling to help with the early efforts of contract tracing. In fact, they then trained other people on contact tracing when Southern Nevada Health District became overwhelmed with the challenges. They worked with our grant coordinator to set up a call center that is dedicated to business owners, to help our residents navigate through all the changes that were happening at a federal level. We spoke with thousands of people directly. We sent out thousands of robocalls and thousands of emails weekly to update our residents on information as it changed, to make sure we were connecting them to federal resources, and when they started to come in, state resources. We also provided rental and mortgage assistance to a number of our homes and households in North Las Vegas. We were also one of the first entities to lead out on working with NV Energy to provide utility assistance to over 4,000 residents.

I think what we did with the CARES dollars really highlights a lot of the efforts we have spent, definitely during the last year, but it also underscores the dedication of our employees, the folks who work here in city hall and throughout the City of North Las Vegas. I would like to now turn the time over to Councilwoman Goynes-Brown, who is going to provide a brief update on SNUMA [page 9, [Exhibit G](#)].

Pamela Goynes-Brown, Councilwoman, Ward 2, City of North Las Vegas:

When this pandemic began, we knew that our kids—I like to call them my babies—would see a tremendous negative impact. The students in North Las Vegas have been disproportionately impacted by the pandemic and the resulting closure of schools. One example, just the data from Clark County School District (CCSD), related to lost students. The data showed that of the students who were not contacted at all by CCSD during the spring 2020 semester, more than one-third, or 36 percent, of those students lived in North Las Vegas ZIP Codes. Of the students who did not log in on the first day of school in the fall 2020 semester, one-quarter, or 25 percent, of those students lived in North Las Vegas ZIP Codes. Just for reference, North Las Vegas only makes up about 10 percent of the county's population.

As our schools have been historically underfunded, and as the state's largest minority-majority city, we see the impact that has been exacerbated here. Our families do not have the same access to technology, high-speed Internet, or other resources that other areas in the

county have. When it became clear at the end of the summer that our babies would not be going back to school in person, we knew that we had to do something about it. We thought outside the box. We started SNUMA, which is a homeschool co-op that operates at three locations around the city: Silver Mesa Recreation Center, Alexander Library, and Neighborhood Recreation Center. We provided free, safe, in-person alternatives for children who would otherwise be left behind. We have a very diverse group of kids, and as you can see [page 9], we provide information both in English and Spanish, to reach as much of our population as possible.

In the fall semester, we had around 50 kids in the micro-school program. Based on their initial assessments, many were falling behind before coming to us. For example, 78 percent tested very far below grade level in reading in August—not just a little bit behind. We had to step in and do something. By the time the semester ended, we saw that kids were making tremendous gains; there were the same results in math. Word of our success got out, so today, we have doubled our number of kids in SNUMA. We have about 100 kids who are spread across our three locations. Other organizations, large and small, from across the country have reached out to us to see how we did it, including the Catholic Archdiocese of Los Angeles and the University of Washington Center for Educational Leadership. The Southern Nevada Urban Micro Academy has been featured in *USA Today* for innovative thinking. Locally, The Shade Tree of Las Vegas set up its own program based on SNUMA. This spring semester is on pace to be just as successful, if not more so, than in the fall. Our kids have embraced the program, and we are excited to continue watching them grow and to make great strides.

With that said, we are going to move into talking about our vaccine efforts [page 10]. I will let our assistant city manager, Alfredo Melesio, take over from here.

Alfredo Melesio Jr., Assistant City Manager, City of North Las Vegas:

Our vaccination efforts began in early January [page 10]. We very quickly ramped them up. We were able to, over a weekend, stand up a robust, popular appointment system at vaxNLV.com, for our point of dispensing event (POD) for just \$6,800, with no crashes or slowdowns for the public. We really wanted to make sure that North Las Vegas residents took advantage of having a large vaccination POD here in the city. We found that people from all over the county were choosing to come to our site because the sign-up process was simple, and our vaccination process is quick and efficient. We also did not want to forget about those who showed very quickly that they were getting under-vaccinated, so we reached out and did pop-up registration sites at neighborhood grocery stores, gas stations, and other businesses. We did bilingual phone calls to residents in targeted ZIP Codes, bilingual emails, and once the state system was up and running, we redirected the vaxNLV.com website to the actual state appointment system, in cooperation with them. We also did public service announcements in English and Spanish on community radio, grocery stores, social media, and television.

These are some of the more recent things we are doing: This week, we have 100 appointments for homebound residents, and we have stood up a hotline for that, as well as a hotline to help folks who need transportation to the different vaccination sites. This weekend, the councilwoman and I volunteered at the Martin Luther King Jr. Senior Center, where we did over 400 vaccinations. This Saturday, we are going to do a drive-up vaccination site here, outside of the North Las Vegas City Hall. To date, we have done about 67,000 vaccinations. Different staff have volunteered at the site. On a personal level, my wife and I also volunteered at a vaccination site this weekend—it is a professional obligation, and also a personal thing for us to get our communities going again. I will turn it back over to the city manager.

Ryann Juden:

On almost the final slide [page 11], we have some upcoming challenges we are looking at. They are not anything really different than what the state is looking at. We are very concerned with what we call the masking effect. So far, there has been about \$20 billion in federal relief dollars that have come to Nevada. That, of course, is dramatically increasing with the latest round of federal relief dollars. We are concerned about what impact that has as far as masking some of the true pain in our community. While yes, we believe the relief dollars are helping to fill some of the trough that we expected with the downturn of the economy, we are also looking very closely at the impact of the moratoriums on rent and mortgage. We do know that nationally, delinquencies are at a two-decade high; that is a concern to us. We think that while we are not seeing high numbers of foreclosures at this point, we do believe that is something we see on the horizon that we need to be preparing for. North Las Vegas in particular led the nation in home foreclosures during the Great Recession. We do not intend to repeat that. We are looking very closely at that because we know it is something that tracks very closely to unemployment. If you see the unemployment numbers for North Las Vegas, some of this is concerning because we are not sure how much of it is true unemployment—meaning people are actually out looking actively for jobs—and how much of it is unemployment that has a bit of a different number due to the relief dollars that are coming into people's homes. But it is something that we are looking closely at. We are trying to identify things, despite we and the state not having U.S. Department of Treasury guidance on what to do with the latest round of relief dollars. The City of North Las Vegas is slated to receive \$47 million. We have been given direction from the mayor and council to use those dollars very similarly to how we used the first round, this time prioritizing to make sure that there is no interruption in the municipal services provided for our residents, as well as looking for ways to provide services. We are thankful for the state and the guidance that they put out in the last couple of weeks. We agree entirely with you all that we need to make sure we do not have duplicates of programs, and that we maximize the impacts of where we reach and touch, and to stay in our lanes in order to maximize the impacts to help our residents. We also want to make sure that these tax dollars go to their intended purpose of providing relief to our businesses and residences.

With that, we are now open to any questions the Committee may have. We tried to keep it as brief as we could, Chair Flores. I will have you know that we did scratch out a lot of stuff and drop some thoughts and notes to keep it brief for this Committee.

Chair Flores:

I appreciate your trying to walk through that as quickly as you could. I know there is so much to cover that it is difficult to make it any shorter. I know we do have a couple of questions. Members, I do want to ask that you please try to focus your energy on the actual bill itself, but there may be something very pressing that you need to get on the record now. Should that be the case, we will give you the opportunity to do so, but I would like to ask that most of us try to focus our questions on the bill itself. With that, we will open it up for questions. [There were none.]

Thank you again for the presentation. I know that we will have some members who are going to directly message you, requesting some additional breakdowns and information that they just want to have as they navigate through this legislative session. With that, we will go ahead and close out the presentation from the City of North Las Vegas and open up the hearing on Assembly Bill 55.

Assembly Bill 55: Makes various changes to the Charter of the City of North Las Vegas. (BDR S-368)

Rhiann Jarvis Denman, Deputy City Attorney, City of North Las Vegas:

I am going to be presenting Assembly Bill 55, which revises provisions to the North Las Vegas City Charter. As a brief background, the City of North Las Vegas brought a similar bill forward last session, Senate Bill 464 of the 80th Session. This was also a bill to amend the city's charter. We received several comments and feedback from this Committee last session on S.B. 464 of the 80th Session, so we did make a lot of changes to the bill draft for A.B. 55 and brought it back this session. The purpose of the bill is just to clarify the language of the charter and city procedures to allow for smoother city operations and clarity in the charter.

I am just going to go through it section by section. Then I will take any questions you may have. Section 1 of the bill is updating language to section 2.020 of the city's charter, changing the word "let" to "entered into," which is clearer. Section 2 of the bill makes changes to section 2.035 of the city's charter. Again, this is just updating language for clarity, changing the word "papers" to "documents and data," to encompass electronic data and various other forms of communication.

Section 3 of the bill makes amendments to section 2.050 of the charter regarding special meetings of the city council. This is an important procedural change, especially with the current state of emergency. The city attorney's office, in working with council and management at the very beginning of the pandemic, realized when we were trying to call emergency meetings that the charter was not specifically clear on emergency meetings. We did have to conduct research with the Open Meeting Law and the Attorney General manual on the Open Meeting Law to determine what steps we could take to get an emergency meeting of the council. The language that is in here is a combination of both the bill we brought forward last year and the research we did this year for our emergency meetings. It is similar to other cities' charters. It clarifies the process for calling an emergency meeting and

special meetings and how those must comply with the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 241 Open Meeting Law. Again, it just provides an avenue for us to know more clearly what to do when emergency meetings need to be called.

Section 4 of the bill makes changes to section 2.100 of the city charter regarding the enactment procedure for ordinances. This is clarifying language clearing up how council introduces, amends, approves, and postpones ordinances. There were some different interpretations throughout the city about how this process worked. Currently, a bill is introduced to the city council at one meeting. Then at the next meeting, it is heard by council again, and that is when it can be adopted and voted upon. This just clarifies that at that second meeting, council can amend the bill, postpone voting on the bill, or vote on the bill at that time. If the bill was postponed, this clarifies that at that next meeting of the council, council can then vote on that bill, rather than having to reintroduce the bill.

Section 5 of the bill is again clarifying language amending section 2.120 of the city charter, changing "corporation" to "city," and just clarifying some of the language in section 5, subsection 1, paragraph (b). That is to maintain consistency throughout the charter. Section 6 of the bill is also clarifying language. This is an amendment to section 2.200 of the charter regarding the powers of city council and rights of way in public places. When we were reviewing the charter for updating language, we realized that this needed to be in there. There are parameters to how council can regulate certain things in public places, and it does have to be constrained by the *Nevada Constitution* and the *United States Constitution*, which it is currently; this language was added in just to make sure that that provision is not taken in a vacuum at some point, and everyone understands that this has to be done in accordance with the *Nevada Constitution* and the *United States Constitution*.

Section 7 of the bill, again, is updating and clarifying language, really to make it sound better and more understandable. In section 8, we changed "animals and poultry" to just "animals"—poultry should be included in that—and we changed the word "pound" to "animal shelter," to clarify more about what that type of facility is. It is more of an animal shelter than a pound. Section 9 of the bill is more clarifying language. This is to ensure that the administration of the city is conducted efficiently and properly, and this would be determined by council. Council is the body that appoints the city manager and has control over that, so it would be up to them to make sure that administration of the city on all affairs is efficient and proper.

Section 10 of the bill, again, is clean-up language. This is changing section 3.040 of the city's charter regarding the city clerk provisions. A lot of the responsibilities in there were duplicative, so this is consolidating and updating that language. We spoke to the city clerk, then went through and made these changes so that it was clearer what the city clerk's duties are, the recordkeeping measures that she has to take, and other things such as that. That was to make sure the section looks better and is easier to understand and interpret.

Section 11 of the bill revises section 3.050 of the charter, adding in a phrase about removal of the city attorney being in accordance with the terms of the city attorney's employment contract. The city attorney's employment contract would necessarily discuss termination, so this was included to ensure that that is the document that is looked at when termination is necessary. Section 12 of the bill is clarifying language to bring this closer to other surrounding jurisdictions' charters—this was specifically taken from Henderson's charter—because these positions all necessarily have the ability to try to collect debts and taxes on behalf of the city. This is an amendment to section 3.090 of the city charter regarding the collection and disposition of moneys to include the city manager and city attorney, as well as their ability to bring legal actions and collect those debts and taxes on behalf of the city.

Section 13 of the bill amends the municipal court section of the charter. This adds an entire new subsection, which would be section 4.025. This was modeled after the Las Vegas City Charter. The language was taken from there, and just the ordinance references were changed to match the city's ordinances. This would allow council the flexibility to appoint hearing commissioners to the court so that those commissioners could hear traffic cases and free up the judicial departments. Las Vegas currently has traffic commissioners; this would be the same thing. The majority of the cases that are heard in municipal court are traffic-related matters, but the court also hears domestic violence, DUI, petty larceny, and other violations of municipal code. This would be an option for the court to have somebody else to hear lower-level offenses, and it would be less of a cost to the city than opening up additional judicial departments. As the city grows, it may be necessary to have this. This provision would not create a hearing commissioner position; this would just give council the option to appoint hearing commissioners in the future, if necessary, for the city to do that.

Section 14 of the bill is a conforming change with section 13. That language was added to section 4.030 to reference the hearing commissioner in that section as well. I will not go through each of sections 15 through 20, but they are updating language, changing the word "situate" to "situated." Again, this is just to make the charter clearer. There were also a few grammatical and consistency changes that were made in those sections. I will not go through each one, but if you do have any questions, please let me know. That concludes my presentation.

Chair Flores:

Thank you for doing that section-by-section walk-through; you would be surprised how many bills we hear where that does not get done. I know we have quite a few questions. We will start with Assemblyman Matthews.

Assemblyman Matthews:

I have questions regarding the sections of the bill that have to do with recordkeeping, particularly section 10, subsection 1, paragraph (c), I believe it is. It strikes provisions that allowed for the record of papers filed by the clerk to be admitted as evidence in court. I was wondering if you could speak to what the intention and objective here is and why this is

necessary. It raises some concerns regarding transparent government and access to information. I was wondering if you could speak to section 10, subsection 1, paragraph (c) and why that is needed if we have concerns about accountability and access.

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

Under section 10, subsection 1, paragraph (c), of section 3.040 of the city charter, those changes were just made because they were duplicative throughout the charter. Right now, the city clerk keeps track of all records that are official records of the city. She keeps all transcripts of city council hearings and of other meetings, meeting minutes, agendas, and that sort of thing. She also keeps any lawsuits that are filed with the city, official orders; those would be kept at the city clerk's office. She keeps all of that as public record and it does all get consolidated by her office so that she can respond to public records requests. She has a specific method of keeping all records together. That language was taken out because there were other areas that referenced that language. If you go through that section, we have not deleted anything specifically; we have just rearranged it. All of that information would still be kept by the clerk's office. This has just changed the wording so that it is a little bit clearer and more concise in that provision. I hope that answers your questions.

Assemblyman Matthews:

This bill also deletes section 10, subsection 8, which made the clerk the custodian of records. Who would become the custodian of records for this bill?

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

The city clerk is still the custodian of records. There are other provisions that still elaborate on that. Section 10, subsection 1, paragraph (b) would include that the clerk keeps the official city records. In section 10, subsection 2, it says that all copies of all papers are kept on file with the city clerk. Again, that provision was taken out to consolidate the duties, but the duties are still listed in there, and the city clerk would still be the official recordkeeper of the city.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

There are a lot of things going on here. I have three questions. The first is from section 4, subsection 2, where it says, "If . . . any amendment may be proposed and the proposed ordinance may be finally voted upon at any future meeting," but when you were presenting, you said, "at the next meeting." "Future" and "next" are very different words—which one should it be? The word "future" has me concerned.

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

I did say "next meeting." I think that is what generally happens; a bill is postponed to the next meeting because there have been concerns raised at a meeting or they are trying to address something. It usually only takes until the next meeting to get it. But yes, the way that the language is drafted, it does say just any future meeting. Council would need to postpone the voting and either say that it would be going to the next meeting or that it would be going to a future meeting of the council.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

I do think it needs to be much firmer than just "future." Unfortunately, I think many of us have been caught up in other things, and then three, four, or five meetings later, those are brought back up. My next question is about both the new language and the current language under section 6. I am very concerned about the freedom of speech here; I realize that this is not new language, but in section 6, subsection 4, paragraph (b), it says, "Any practice tending to annoy persons passing in such public places." That is very concerning language, and there are many other areas of section 6 that are almost an infringement on freedom of speech. If you could expand on that a little more, I would greatly appreciate it.

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

We certainly had the same concerns as you when we first proposed this language during the last session. The city attorney's office was reviewing the charter changes, and we thought that it was pretty interesting that that language had already been there and that it did need to be reined in. Anything that council does regulate in public places regarding speech is governed by the First Amendment and the *Nevada Constitution's* First Amendment as well. That was our concern, and that was why that language was added in. But yes, a lot of that language is very antiquated and must have just come up with the original drafting of the charter. I do understand the concerns there, and we share them. We want to make sure that it is clear that the city can only regulate within the bounds of the *Nevada Constitution* and the *United States Constitution*.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

I understand where you are coming from, but I still think there is an opportunity for us to clean that up even further in the policy language. It is a concern. My last question comes from section 13. I know that you mentioned that it comes from the Las Vegas City Charter. Is it preceded in any other city charters?

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

I am not aware of this language being in any other charters. No, I believe this is just in the Las Vegas City Charter. My assumption is that because Las Vegas is a very large city, they would need the hearing commissioners, and as our city grows, our concern is that we may eventually need a hearing commissioner to assist the judicial departments in municipal court.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

I am going to need to you to walk me through this. I want to make sure that our individuals are still able to have a public defender, if necessary. When it comes to a hearing commissioner, I do not know enough about the position and how they are utilized.

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

The hearing commissioner would be taking the place of whichever judge is there. A hearing commissioner would essentially be the same exact person as a judge, but that person would not carry the additional cost to the city because this person could be contracted or hired on a part-time basis—that sort of thing. It would not necessarily require the same things, such as a whole new department and things such as that. However, they would still be hearing cases;

people would still have the right to representation on certain cases. For traffic tickets, that is a little bit different. But it would be the same. They would still conduct a hearing or still conduct trials if people wanted to go to trial on traffic matters. Other than that, it would just help the city avoid the cost of creating an entirely new judicial department.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

Would there be a listing of where those public defenders would be and what sort of court cases the public defenders would still be able to be utilized for? Or would that be an internal policy? I need a little bit more; I need to get into the weeds, in a way.

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

People are provided the right to representation on cases based on the U.S. Constitution and Nevada law. Anybody who is entitled to a public defender in a criminal case would still be entitled to a public defender, regardless of whether they are in front of a hearing commissioner or a judge.

Assemblywoman Considine:

I am actually asking a few questions in the same area as Assemblywoman Anderson. I know that you mentioned that the hearing commissioner would take the place of a judge but would be saving money. The hearing masters are appointed, so to me, that would be different than a judge because judges are elected. It was my understanding that recently, North Las Vegas expanded to another municipal court and brought on another judge. I know you are looking down the road, but what would the trigger be for that, when the caseloads get so high that they would then need someone else to step in? Are they there now? Has this other new municipal court judge alleviated all of that?

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

The City of North Las Vegas did recently open another judicial department. The caseload has been shifted, but the purpose of that second judicial department was to create a specialty court program to promote rehabilitation and improve recidivism within the community. The focus of that court is on assisting defendants in getting help and seeking the resources they need to stop committing crimes and to be able to be a productive member of society. That is the focus of the new judicial department. Those kinds of programs take a significant amount of time because the judge and the entire team—the prosecutors, the public defenders—everybody has to be involved in that process. It can take up to two years, even, to get people through that program and to help them get the resources that they need.

That court is going to be very busy covering those matters. Taking away traffic cases would possibly help in the future. I think right now, before we had two judicial departments, the court had been using pro tem judges to hear traffic matters in municipal court because the judge could not handle all of the traffic cases plus the additional matters that come through the municipal court. As of now, I believe that the two departments are handling everything that is coming through without the need to use pro tem judges to hear those traffic matters. In the future, if the city does continue to grow, and additional matters need to be heard, those traffic cases could possibly go to a hearing commissioner.

To get to your other point about appointments, yes, these hearing commissioners would be appointed. That is why we would not want them taking on matters such as domestic violence or DUIs. Those would be for the municipal judges who are in the elected positions, to work with defendants in those matters.

Assemblywoman Considine:

That gets to what I was asking. You mentioned the specialty court program. A specialty program does take a lot of time to do. You are saying that the hearing commissioners would not step in and take up the space for that judge in that specialty court program because it is so focused and takes so much time. Is that correct?

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

I apologize; I am not sure if I understood your question. I do not know if this will help clarify, but the hearing commissioner would just be there to take the overflow traffic cases. I believe that is how it works in the City of Las Vegas, where they hear traffic cases and step in to take those matters away from the judges.

Assemblywoman Considine:

To me, having an elected judge overseeing the bigger cases is very important. I was trying to get to this: Why not just expand? If one was a specialty court, why not, in the future, just expand to another judge as opposed to hearing commissioners, who are appointed?

One last question: What is the appointment process? Who is doing those appointments?

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

The reasoning for the hearing commissioner, and not just opening another judicial department, would be to keep the costs down for the city but still allow for quality municipal services to continue, so that matters can be heard fairly quickly. There is a cost to the city when opening an entire judicial department: there are additional staffing costs, additional prosecutors that would be needed, and another public defender that would be needed in that courtroom. The traffic commissioner would still have prosecutors and defense counsel in there; it would just be an additional staffing issue I believe.

The appointment process was your second question. That would be done by the council. The way that the City of Las Vegas did this is that they passed and adopted an ordinance regarding how hearing commissioners would be selected. I imagine the council would do something similar to that, where we would take a list or have people provide different resumes and that sort of thing. Then council could appoint hearing commissioners through that method.

Assemblywoman Considine:

My last quick question is this: When is the next election for your municipal court judges?

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

I believe the next judicial election is in 2022.

Assemblywoman Considine:

It is my understanding that the current municipal court judges are now up for reelection in 2022. If that is correct, I am done. If not, please correct me.

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

To answer your question, one of the judicial departments is up for election in 2022. The judge for the new department was appointed recently because that new department was opened. To ensure that the judicial departments were staggered, that judge was appointed to a longer term. That will not be up for election in the 2022 election.

Assemblywoman Torres:

I have a couple more questions about the hearing commissioners as well. I appreciate you for answering all the questions we have on this; I think it is a significant change to the charter, and I just want to make sure that I understand it a little bit better. I am wondering what other cities have similar language to this around hearing commissioners. Is there a reason why we would go for hearing commissioners instead of just expanding the number of municipal judges?

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

The other charter that has this same language is the City of Las Vegas. That is where we got the language from. We mirrored it after the Las Vegas charter and just changed the references to the North Las Vegas Municipal Code. The language was in there so that hearing commissioners could hear misdemeanors other than DUIs, so we wanted to make that clear in here. To go to your second question, the hearing commissioner would be a lower cost to the city, to allow some of those traffic cases to be heard on a faster basis. If the courts get clogged up, an appointed hearing commissioner could take those cases away from the other departments, so they can focus on the higher-level offenses and other issues that are going on in the city.

Assemblywoman Torres:

I am wondering how many cases the municipal judges are currently dealing with. If this is higher than the average, what are other cities handling?

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

I do not have the specific numbers for this year, but I can tell you that in fiscal year 2018, there were 25,928 cases filed and 20,336 of those were traffic cases. In fiscal year 2019, there were 28,899 cases filed and 23,607 of those were traffic cases. In 2020, during the pandemic, there were 21,642 cases filed and 17,057 of those were traffic cases. That information comes from the Supreme Court website. They have the annual report of the judiciary that includes those numbers. That is to show that the majority of those cases are traffic cases that are filed each year. The court does hear a significant number of cases for the number of departments that are in the city. The Las Vegas Municipal Court has

six departments and a hearing commissioner. They do have a larger population than the City of North Las Vegas, but Reno, which is a similarly situated city and has a closer population, has four judges. The City of North Las Vegas, up until two months ago, had only one judge. There were a significant number of cases being heard by one judicial department.

Assemblywoman Torres:

I guess that answers the question, right? If the City of Reno has a similar population to the City of North Las Vegas and they have several more judges, it seems to me that should be the way we are moving—increasing the number of municipal judges instead of the number of hearing commissioners present. I do not know that I can get on board with having a hearing commissioner. I just do not see that it is necessary. If there is any data you have that says there is a significantly higher number of cases in the City of North Las Vegas, and shows how many cases those judges are dealing with in comparison to other cities in our state, such as Reno or Las Vegas, that would be helpful. But without seeing that data, I do not know if that is something I really understand.

I have another question regarding section 11 of the legislation. Section 11, subsection 5 says, "The City Attorney serves at the pleasure of the City Council and may be removed at any time in accordance with the terms of the City Attorney's employment contract." I am wondering if this is standard with other city charters or if this is something different. What is the reasoning or the logic behind this?

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

Just to go back to your point on hearing commissioners: The judicial departments, again, take more of a structural, budgetary issue. This was to address that, and allow another avenue for cases to be heard, if necessary, in the future. But yes, if the population grows, a judicial department may be necessary in the future. To answer your question regarding section 11, there are other city charters that point to employment agreements. The way that the city charter is written is that the city manager and the city attorney are both appointed directly by, and serve at the will of, council. Both of those positions have employment agreements that explain how each of those positions should be terminated. This is just to clarify that the terms of the employment agreement should govern, and that addresses due process issues in the firing and hiring of those positions. I am not sure if that specific language is in any other city charter, but there are other city charters that discuss employment agreements.

Assemblywoman Torres:

Before voting on this bill—obviously, we will move quickly with the deadline fast approaching—I would like to see what the language looks like in other city charters, so that we can make sure it is standard and comparable to what is being done in other city charters, so that it is not something completely different in the City of North Las Vegas.

I have a couple more questions, if that is all right. I am looking at section 10 of the bill where we are changing some of the responsibilities of the city clerk. Could you explain some of the logic for removing some of the responsibilities, such as section 10, subsection 3,

which says, "Supervise and coordinate administrative . . . clerical work," or section 10, subsection 4, which says, "Attend all meetings of the City Council"? I know the important role that our Chief Clerk has here in the State Assembly, so I imagine they have a similarly important role within the city council. I was wondering why we would remove those sections.

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

The changes are not to completely change the city clerk position. This is really just a consolidation effort and cleaning up this language. When we discussed it with the clerk's office, this was her recommendation for getting this in line with what she actually does and making this a little bit clearer. If you look at section 10, subsection 1, paragraph (c), that provision still includes that it is her duty to attend all meetings of the city council. The record-keeping for the city is still part of her duties through section 10, subsection 2. Also, section 10, subsection 1, paragraph (e) includes keeping transcripts of the meetings. Those subsections that were taken out are in other parts of that provision. They are just worded a little bit differently to make it clear what she does. We did not take any of her duties away that I am aware of, other than updating language to make it sound more up to date, more consolidated, and provide a clearer representation of what the city clerk does.

Assemblywoman Torres:

I see what you are acknowledging there. Lastly, I want to acknowledge my colleague Assemblywoman Anderson's comment on section 6 of the legislation. I think this is an opportunity for us to make some changes to how that looks. I do have some fears that section 6, subsection 4 could be easily misconstrued or abused by local governments. I hope that we can work on some clean-up language or move parts of that. I think that those are already things that local law enforcement and agencies would have the ability to do. I am not quite comfortable with that specific language regarding public demonstrations and processions, which includes our right to protest and our right to assemble, or the language about preventing riots without a definition of the word "riot." I just have a couple of concerns about that language that I hope you can address.

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

We agree. We do not want this provision to be misconstrued. We certainly want to ensure that all practices are being done in accordance with the *Nevada Constitution* and the *United States Constitution*. I look forward to working with you on changing that language to meet those concerns.

Assemblyman Ellison:

My question pertains to section 3, which is about special meetings. You removed, under section 3, subsection 2, paragraph (a), "No contract involving the expenditure of money, except emergency purchases, may be made or claim allowed." That would enhance the body really badly when you have such long agendas. I brought this up once before, so I am glad to see that removed. Was that just to bring it up to the times?

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

Yes. That provision was very restrictive for the city council for special meetings. That portion of the charter provision was changed based on other cities' charters, to allow for special meetings to include anything that is included in the agenda. Special meetings still have to be noticed in accordance with NRS Chapter 241, so they have to be posted and everybody has to know what is going on at that meeting, but this will allow the city council to conduct the business that is included in the agenda at the special meeting of council without the restrictions that were currently in that bill. That allows them to address things that need to be addressed on a more urgent basis than the bimonthly meetings that they currently hold.

Assemblyman Ellison:

All of my questions have been answered. There were a couple of tweaks that were mentioned in there, but other than that, I thought it was a pretty good bill.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

I tried to do some research during this hearing. Do you have a charter committee or is this language being brought forward from the city council? Is the appointment done in the NRS statutes? I can get you that number, if you would like.

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

The charter does not currently have a charter committee, and the city does not have a charter committee. The original changes from S.B. 464 of the 80th Session were brought to council back in 2018, before the 2019 Legislative Session. For this legislative session, they were brought to council again in July of last year; they were brought forward at a public hearing, and the city did not receive any comments on these changes.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

I would do a push—with a city of 246,000, it might make sense to have a charter committee as well.

Assemblywoman Martinez:

In regard to your newly appointed judge, how long is his term?

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

The new judge was appointed to a term lasting until 2026.

Assemblywoman Martinez:

Is that consistent with the other terms as well, or is this a longer term?

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

Currently, judges who are elected to serve for a term of six years. The appointment process is a little different. When a new department is created, under the charter the city council must appoint a judge to the new department. The judge's terms need to be staggered so that no two judges are elected at the same time. This was part of the reason the council

appointed the judge to the longer term. Additionally, this decision was made by working with the courts to make sure that this specialty court program got off and was launched successfully—this was also public policy to allow the judge the time to get the resources and build the relationships necessary to make the specialty court a success. It does take significant effort to do that. The judge is building relationships with different rehabilitation programs and different services that may be needed for defendants or people who come into the court system in North Las Vegas and need those services and help. This will help build up that program to make it as robust as the city and the municipal court want it to be, which is making sure it provides a broad reach and really addresses the issues that our citizens are seeing.

Assemblywoman Martinez:

If you are trying to stagger them, would it make more sense to have the term up in 2024 instead of 2026? It seems like a long time for an appointed position.

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

Again, I think that was a public policy decision, just to make sure that court has the time to build up the specialty court program and make sure that it can achieve the goals of the municipal court and the city.

Assemblywoman Thomas:

I have two brief questions. Let us go with a follow-up question about the specialty court. In the specialty court, are the cases the judge will be handling municipal cases? If they are, why is there a two-year program? If a person is sentenced in specialty court, would they fall under cases that prolong their sentence to two years?

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

These are all going to be municipal court cases heard in the specialty court. I apologize—I believe I said "two years" earlier. I was thinking of other specialty courts in the valley, where some of these programs do take a long time to have people go through them. I am not sure what the length of time will be for the court cases that are heard in the specialty court program in North Las Vegas. I believe it will depend on the offense and the services that are needed for each of the defendants. It would certainly not go beyond the term of confinement; it would be whatever they would be subject to under the current penalty system for misdemeanor crimes. There may be some additional services that are given through the court process. The programs do take a significant amount of effort to make sure that people are actually succeeding in these programs and that they have a lot of judicial oversight to make sure that they are meeting their goals.

Assemblywoman Thomas:

I would really like it if you could give more written detail about the specialty courts and how they would flow because this is a concern to me, especially when we are talking about issues concerning our veterans. My second question is about section 13, subsection 2, paragraph (b). It says that the hearing commissioner has to be a resident of the state, but for how long? Could residency be six weeks?

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

For your first question regarding the specialty courts, if you are interested in seeing more information, there was a hearing recently. I believe it was in March. It took place in front of city council, where Judge Lee, who was the appointed judge to that department, put together a presentation of the specialty courts and all that they do. There are veterans programs included in that, and I am sure that I could absolutely find additional written information for you to review regarding the specialty court programs and all that those entail. I know that council and the municipal court are very excited about the program, and doing more to help the community, reduce recidivism, improve rehabilitation, and work toward building a better community with the court system. We can certainly make those available to you.

For your second question regarding the provision that the hearing master be a resident of the state, again, this language was taken directly from the City of Las Vegas and mirrored after the City of Las Vegas. I believe that is what they had in theirs. We could certainly amend that to include a time frame for how long that person should be a resident of the state or with a specific number of years.

Assemblywoman Thomas:

I would appreciate getting that information and for you to take a look at residency.

Chair Flores:

Members, do we have any other questions? [There were none.] I echo the sentiments of some of our colleagues who are raising some of the concerns, but I am confident that we will be able to work together on some of these sections to get you moving in the right direction. With that, we will open it up to those wishing to testify in support of Assembly Bill 55. [There was no one.] At this time, we will go those wishing to testify in opposition to Assembly Bill 55. [There was no one.] Next, we will invite those wishing to testify in the neutral position to Assembly Bill 55 to call in. [There was no one.] Could we have you come back with your closing remarks? We may also have one or two additional questions.

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

We really appreciate your comments and feedback. We look forward to working with you on this bill and getting this moving forward.

Assemblywoman Martinez:

I wanted to clarify something: Why do the judges need to be staggered? I am not really understanding that.

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

I am not sure what the policy was behind that from the beginning, but I know that it is important to have some sort of consistency within the municipal court so that things can change gradually rather than everything changing at once. It is probably helpful to have other people in there to help with new judges and that kind of thing. But I am not 100 percent sure what the background is on that and why that is necessary.

Assemblywoman Martinez:

Do they stagger the judges in other departments or places that you know of?

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

I believe that for most judicial departments, not all of them will be up for vote at the same time. There may be a number of them at the same time in other courts, but not all of them at the same time. For example, in our district court, a lot of the positions were up for election during the election last year. It was not all of the judicial departments, but there were several of them up at the same time, but in that instance those judicial departments would be staggered.

Assemblyman Ellison:

I wanted to add that most positions, like the city council, the county commissioners, and judges, are staggered. The reason for that is for historical knowledge, so that if you have a new judge coming in, you still have historical knowledge from the other sitting judges. That is usually why they do that; it is pretty common.

Assemblywoman Brown-May:

I am trying to wrap my head around the appointment process versus the election of a judge. Being in an appointed seat currently, I am here to fill an existing term. Could you talk to us a little bit about why we would appoint a judge in North Las Vegas for a longer term instead of a shorter term, instead of an election.

Rhiann Jarvis Denman:

The appointment for the current judge was due to a new department opening. It was not to fill a vacancy in the current situation. With respect to hearing commissioners, this is just to hear lower-level traffic cases that can be heard and dealt with at a faster pace than some of the judicial departments could hear it. Again, that hearing commissioner provision just takes some burden off the courts, if necessary, in the future. Adding this provision would not necessarily give the municipal court hearing commissioners at this time.

Assemblywoman Considine:

I wanted to make a comment on something I am seeing, following up on Assemblywoman Torres' comment earlier. I seem to see a movement away from hearing masters. I understand that there is an issue about funding. If this court was created to be a specialty court, that is fantastic, but if the money can be found to create a specialty court for something, I would hope that it could also be found to allow people who have traffic issues, criminal issues, or any of those issues, to be in front of someone who is elected as opposed to appointed. Hearing masters being appointed, rather than elected, is something I think we are trying to move away from. I wanted to echo Assemblywoman Torres' earlier point.

Chair Flores:

Members, any additional questions? [There were none.] I want to thank the City of North Las Vegas for powering through that original presentation and coming prepared to answer a lot of our questions. I anticipate that members will continue to reach out and work with you;

North Las Vegas, thank you for your willingness to work with our members. I am sure we will land somewhere good, where we can take care of all the issues we have on our end, as well as the big concerns you have to take care of on your end. With that, we will close out the hearing on Assembly Bill 55. Next on the agenda is public comment.

Darlene Anderson, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada:

I have been a resident of Clark County for the last three years, and what I have noticed about the public education system is that for African-American children, they do not provide the academic progress for the maintenance of effort for those children who are at-risk. There was a hearing, and Nevada agreed to provide services to the children in juvenile hall; they were not getting any services. But I do not hear any conversation about the maintenance of effort for the children who are at-risk and who are Black, and how our county has a 259 percent willful defiance issue. But the [unintelligible] money and the learning loss money has to do with services for people who have not had any services. That is what I want to hear about what is happening in Nevada because I do not hear it yet.

Annemarie Grant, Private Citizen, Quincy, Massachusetts:

My brother, Thomas Purdy, was a guest at the Peppermill Casino when he had a mental health crisis and was hog-tied by the Reno Police Department and then 40 minutes later, was still hog-tied, asphyxiated by Washoe County deputies. Today, I want to read a little excerpt from the Sparks Police independent investigation regarding the Peppermill because I know politicians do like to take money from casinos:

"During the investigation, Peppermill security officer Montiel informed investigators that she had issues with the way some Peppermill security officers treated Purdy. Montiel didn't like the way Purdy was taken down the stairs and how Purdy was dropped on the ground. Montiel also stated that during the incident, she wasn't sure how it happened, but she heard a smack and saw Russel Smith on top of Purdy." That is the security guy; their names were Andrew Miller, Zachary Siner, Kyle Vonkrauss, Samantha Montiel, and Russel Smith.

A video that was provided by the Peppermill depicts Russel Smith in the holding room at the Peppermill after the incident at 02:46 hours. On the video, a female enters the holding room and Smith states, "You missed your opportunity, this blank boy."

The female tells Russel Smith that she went to lunch, and Russel Smith states, "Eff lunch, this mf was fighting and yelling." Russel Smith then lowers his voice and looks around the room before saying, "He's at the top of the stairs. I pulled his ass down the steps." As Russel Smith made this statement, he pulled his arms back, demonstrating a tugging motion.

The female then walks to a nearby telephone, and as the female makes the call, Smith turns away from the camera and makes another comment about his actions as he motions with his right arm. The video tape stopped a short time later. That video is on Reno Cop Watch, the only agency that ever reached out to assist my family in getting any truth outside. I urge you all to go to the Reno Cop Watch Facebook page and watch the videos. Please support bills that promote transparency and accountability.

John Carlo, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

How are you all doing today? I hope that each one of you remembers the Lord Jesus Christ's sacrificial death yesterday, that he died for you and me and the whole world. I am calling to bring your attention to voting integrity. One thing I heard you guys did not mention was fingerprint verification. We need to add security to our voting integrity. We need no Internet connection; I do not know why you guys want to keep using the Internet and the national database for elections. Bad, bad, bad. Do not do that. And also—who else is in the government?—that is what I want. You guys need to work on the unemployment system. It is not working for us, and that was before COVID-19. I do not know who heads that up; I cannot get them to call me back to tell me why they are so inefficient. If you guys want us to vote for the common man, you all need to focus on the things that are going to help the general public, not just people with a lot of money. All right?

Chair Flores:

We will continue with those wishing to testify during public comment. [There was no one.] Members, thank you this morning for your attentiveness in trying to power through what was a pretty lengthy meeting this morning. Tomorrow, we have quite a bit of work to do in just our work sessions, and then we have four bill hearings: Assembly Bill 331, Assembly Bill 334, Assembly Bill 335, and Assembly Bill 445. I wanted to use today as a gauge for whether or not we could power through everything before 11:30 a.m. We finished just about six minutes prior, and that was with three bills only, and then powering through only one presentation, asking no questions, and not doing a work session. I do not know that it is realistic for us to achieve the same tomorrow. Just using today as a gauge, I think we are going to have to start tomorrow at 8 a.m.

I know the agenda is posted at 9 a.m., so I wanted to get clarity and make sure that everybody understands that for the sake of getting everything done and ensuring that we do not inadvertently cut a bill presentation short, we are going to start tomorrow morning at 8 a.m. I know the rest of the week, we still have it listed as 9 a.m. Again, we will use tomorrow as a gauge; if we can finish early tomorrow, and we realize that we did not need all that extra time, then perhaps we can stick with having the Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday meetings at the regular 9 a.m. start time. I appreciate everybody's flexibility.

Again, members, thank you for the questions today. Please give yourself an opportunity to go through all those items on the work session and those items that we will be hearing tomorrow so that we can be effective with our time. This meeting is adjourned [at 11:26 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Lindsey Howell
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Edgar Flores, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

[Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster.

[Exhibit C](#) is proposed amendment 3189 to Assembly Bill 271, dated April 2, 2021, submitted by Troyce Krumme, Vice Chair, Las Vegas Police Managers and Supervisors Association.

[Exhibit D](#) is an email entitled "Transporting deceased accross state lines," dated April 9, 2020, submitted by Jennifer Kandt, Executive Director, Funeral and Cemetery Services Board.

[Exhibit E](#) is a proposed amendment to Assembly Bill 437, submitted by Jennifer Kandt, Executive Director, Funeral and Cemetery Services Board.

[Exhibit F](#) is written testimony dated April 6, 2021, submitted by William Webb, Coroner, Elko, Nevada.

[Exhibit G](#) is a copy of a PowerPoint presentation titled "City of North Las Vegas," dated April 2021," presented by Ryann Juden, City Manager, City of North Las Vegas, and other City of North Las Vegas staff.